The template data structure system of claim 6, [wherein] wherein said template data structure is provided at the level of an operating system of a computer, said grids comprising frames in which computer programs can be displayed.

Claim 21 (cancelled)

Claim 22 (currently amended)

The method of claim 11, [wherein] wherein said template data structure is provided at the level of an operating system of a computer, said grids comprising frames in which computer programs can be displayed.

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-22 are presently pending in the application. Claims 17, 19 and 21 are cancelled by the present amendment.

A. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 17, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Frontpage 98 (hereinafter Frontpage), copyright 1997 by Sams.net Publising, pages 359-381 in view of England, U.S. 6,144,991 filed 02/1998.

The applicant proposes that the rejection of the above-identified claims over Frontpage and England is invalid because Frontpage, alone or in conjunction with England, fails to teach the applicant's invention.

Regarding independent Claim 1, the Examiner recites in the rejection of independent claim 1 that Frontpage teaches that "the proportioning of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure (Frontpage, page 365, lines 23-page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width

ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring frames' properties, such as **"borderless frames" and/or resizing frames** (*bold type added by the applicant*) to occupy some percentage of the entire frame)."

The nature of the operations that lead to changes of frames' properties can be categorized into two types. The first type of operation does not involve changes in the size, location, orientation, or shape of any frame, or the total number of frames. Such operations include changing the bordered frames into "borderless frames" by making the borders invisible and vice versa, changing the color of the frame borders, changing the color, shade and/or pattern of the frame bodies, etc. It is apparent that such operations would automatically preserve the length-to-width ratio of the frames, either in Frontpage, the present invention or any other prior art. However, the present invention is concerned with the second type of operation, which involves changes in at least one of the properties selected from the group consisting of size, location, orientation, and shape of at least one of the frames and/or the subdivision of at least one frame. The support for the claims for present invention are of the second type of operation and can be found in lines 14, page 17 to lines 17, page 19 of the specification, figures 9-11 and claims 17 prior to cancellation.

Claim 1 has been amended to clearly show the limitation that the operations on the frames are of the second type.

It is the applicant's position that the present invention teaches, and Frontpage fails to teach, the automatic maintenance of length-to-width ratios of the frames when one or more frames are subject to an operation of the second type. It is in this context that the

Examiner erred in his position that Frontpages teaches the automatic maintenance of the length-to-width ratios of frames when "resizing frames".

For the purpose of simplicity, all operations on the frames hereinafter refer to the second type of operation, in which at least one frame is re-sized, re-positioned, re-oriented, re-shaped, and/or subdivided.

The passage in Frontpage recited by the Examiner does not teach at all how to automatically maintain the aspect ratio (length-to-width ratio) of the frames when they are operated upon (second type), rather it teaches how to keep the widths and heights of frames at constant preset values or maintain a preset ratio between the width of the frame and the width of the display window and separately maintain a preset ratio between the length of the frame and the length of the display window. There is a critical difference between the concepts taught by the present invention and Frontpage.

Probably the most relevant Frontpage passage is from line 14, page 367 to line 13, page 368. It reads as follows:

"The Frame Size section in the Frame Properties dialog box enables you to set the width of a frame when there are two or more columns in your frameset or the height of a frame when there are two or more rows in your frameset. There are three types of width or height settings from which to choose:

Use the Pixel setting when you want the width or height of your frame to always be the same width or height in pixels...

Use the Percent setting when you want the width or height of your frame to always be a percentage of full browser width or height...

The Relative setting is used in conjunction with either the Pixel or Percent setting to size any remaining frames to the space that is available after you define pixel or percent width or height for other frames in your frameset..."

Regardless which type of settings or any combinations thereof are used, the passage and experiment by the applicant using a Frontpage software, both confirm that Frontpage does not teach or suggest the automatic maintenance of aspect ratio of the frames upon an operations of the second type. In addition, Frontpage does not teach or enable one to do so when there is more than one frame in the browser window and the browser window is being resized, especially if the aspect ratio of the browser window itself is changed during the resizing. For example, the concept of "Percentage" simply fixes the width of the frame to be a certain percentage of the width of the browser window and the height of the frame to be a certain percentage of the height of the browser window. The use of any of the three frame size specifying means in Frontpage does not allow fixing the length-to-width ratio of the frame. Actually when the concept of "percentage" is used, the change in the browser window's aspect ratio during resizing automatically leads to the change in the aspect ratio of each individual frame due to the Frontpage's requirement that the width of the frame be kept at a preset ratio to the width of the browser window and the length of the frame be kept at a preset ratio to the length of the browser window. The various combinations of the three types of settings lead to possibly more complicated scenarios but none of them is capable of automatically maintaining the aspect ratio of each of the frames when the browser window is being manipulated with changes in the browser window's aspect ratio, among other operations of the second type on one or more of the frames.

England also does not teach the invention in Claim 1 that "the desired 2x1 dimensional unit length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display devices, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing."

Therefore, Claim 1, after the amendment which clearly distinguishes the present invention from the teaching of Frontpage, is not obvious over Frontpage in view of England.

The Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 3, 4 and 5, which depend on claim 1, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn due to the arguments presented for the independent claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 6, which carries the same limitation as claim 1, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn under the same rationale as the arguments presented for Claim 1 after the amendment to claim 6.

Regarding claims 8, 9, and 10, which depend on the independent claim 6, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn due to the arguments presented for the independent claim 6.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on the independent claim 6, the Examiner's rejection is avoided due to the cancellation of the claim.

Regarding independent claim 11, which carries the same limitations as claim 1, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn under the same rationale as the arguments presented for claim 1 after the amendment to claim 11.

Regarding claims 12, 13, and 14, which depend on the independent claim 11, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn due to the arguments presented for claim 11.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on the independent claim 11, the Examiner's rejection is avoided due to the cancellation of the claim.

B. The Examiner further rejected the claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Microsoft Frontpage 98" (hereinafter Frontpage), copyright 1997 by Sams.net Publishing, pages 359-381 in view of England, U.S. 6,144,991 filed 02/1998 and Courter et al., "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition", ISBN: 0782123139, Pub. Date: February 1999, pages 105-145; 937-981; and 1031-1056.

Regarding the independent **claim 15**, the Examiner's rejection is directly dependent on, among other factors, the inaccurate reading of the teaching of Frontpage (line 19 of page 9 to line 2 of page 10 of the office action) that "a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (Frontpage, page 365, lines 23-page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring frames' properties, such as **creating borderless, resizing the frames** (*bold type added by the applicant*) to occupy some percentage of the entire frame)." The rationale for declaring the above reading of Frontpage inapplicable (creating borderless frames) and inaccurate (resizing the frames) has been presented in the arguments for Claim 1. Furthermore, England and Courter, when considered alone or in any combination with Frontpage, do not teach or suggest "the desired 2x1 dimensional unit length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to

generate a resulting display on computer display device, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing" as taught in claim 15.

Claim 15 has been amended to clearly show the limitation that the operations on the frames are of the second type. Therefore, the rejection to claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on the independent Claim 15, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn due to the arguments presented for Claim 15.

C. The Examiner further rejected Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter et al., "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition", ISBN: 0782123139, Pub. Date: February 1999, pages 105-145; 937-981; and 1031-1056.

Regarding independent claim 15, the Examiner recites in the rejection of the independent claim 15 that Courter teaches (lines 16 – 21, page 13 and lines 14 – 19, page 14 of the office action) that "a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (Courter, page 136, last paragraph – page 138, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of grids in the table and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring table's properties, such as **coloring borders** (*bold type added by the applicant*) (grids/cells of the table)."

The operations such as coloring the borders, as recited by the Examiner, belong to the first type of operations as categorized above for claim 1, and therefore would certainly not lead to any change in the length-to-width ratio of the grids/cells of the table.

However, similar to the arguments presented above for claim 1, the present invention is concerned with the operations of the second type, which involves re-sizing, re-positioning, re-orienting, re-shaping, and/or subdividing at least one frame.

Claim 15 has been amended to clearly show the limitation that the operations on the frames are of the second type.

Courter does not teach the automatic maintenance of length-to-width ratios of the grids/cells of the table when grids/cells are subjected to the operations of the second type.

Therefore, the rejection to Claim 15 has been avoided by the amendments made thereto and should therefore be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on the independent claim 15, the rejection has been avoided by the amendments made to claim 15 and should be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 11, the two independent claims recites the limitations similar to claim 15 and the rejection has been avoided by the amendments made thereto. on the same rationale presented in the arguments for Claim 15, that rejection of claims 1 and 11 should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, the rejection has been avoided due to the amendment to the parent claim (claim 1) and the arguments presented for claim 1. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 6, which is for a computer system performing the method combination of claims 1 and 3, the rejection has been avoided by the amendment made thereto and on similar rationale for the arguments presented for claim 1.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, the rejection has been avoided by to the amendment made to claim 6 and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, the rejection has been avoided by to the amendment made to claim 11, and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, the rejection has been avoided by the amendment made to claim 11, and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

D. The Examiner further rejected claims 18, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter as applied to claims 1, 6 and 11 as explained above, and further in view of Hargove, U.S. 5,371,847, patented 1994.

Claims 18, 20 and 22 are dependent on claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively. Hargove does not teach or suggest the automatic maintenance of the length-to-width ratio of the frames.

Therefore, as a result of the amendments to the corresponding parent claims (claim 1, 6, and 11) which place them in an allowable state, the rejection to claims 18, 20 and 22 should be withdrawn.

E. The Examiner rejected claims 18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Frontpage 98 in view of England as applied to claims 1, 6, and 11 as explained above, and further in view of Hargove, U.S. 5,371,847, patented 1994.

As argued above, the parent claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to clearly show limitations that are not taught or suggested by Frontpage. Frontpage, either considered alone or in view of Hargove, does not pose a proper basis for rejecting claims 1, 6 and 11.

Therefore, the rejection to claims 18, 20, and 22 has been avoided and should be withdrawn.

A clean sheet of the claims is provided.

Allowance of the claims

As a result of the amendments to the claims as detailed above and in view of the arguments presented to clearly distinguish the claims and teaching of the present invention from the teaching of the cited prior arts, claims 1, 3-6, 8-16, 18, 20 and 22 are in a state for allowance. Notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted

Evelyn M. Sommer
Registration No. 19, 603
Attorney for Applicant
250 Park Avenue, Room 825
New York, NY 10022
Phone: 212-527-2657

Certificate of Mailing I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the _19_ day of _May_ , 2005.

17